



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/655,235	09/04/2003	Fausto Casaro	02-41 US	5686
23693	7590	10/17/2008		
Varian Inc. Legal Department 3120 Hansen Way D-102 Palo Alto, CA 94304			EXAMINER CHANG, RICK KILTAE	
			ART UNIT 3726	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 10/17/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/655,235	Applicant(s) CASARO, FAUSTO	
	Examiner Rick K. Chang	Art Unit 3726	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 August 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 3726

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 8/8/08 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shigihara et al (US 6,094,815) in view of Sun (US 5,507,617).

Shigihara discloses a workpiece comprising a bar (S1 says "cut bar into billet"); forging (S4) to form the cylindrical body being a semi-finished part having a homogenous mechanical properties (col. 4, lines 50-53); 10 and 20 (they have the same diameter; 50 has the same diameter as 10 and 20) prevent the workpiece, the bar, from radial expansion; 80 and 22 form cavities while the workpiece is prevented from its radial expansions by a mold 20 (col. 4, lines 31-45); polishing the cavities (col. 4, lines 11-13).

Shigihara fails to disclose milling the vanes.

Sun discloses milling the vanes (col. 5, lines 41-43).

Art Unit: 3726

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Shigihara by milling the vanes, as taught by Sun, for the purpose of removing unwanted burrs and imperfections from the vanes to meet the desired design characteristics.

4. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shigihara et al (US 6,094,815)/Sun (US 5,507,617) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Papst et al (US 3,786,290).

Shigihara/Sun fail to disclose a bell-shaped rotor.

Papst discloses a bell-shaped rotor (14).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Shigihara/Sun by forming a bell-shaped rotor to the Shigihara/Sun, as taught by Papst, for the purpose of forming a cage to carry impeller blades.

5. Claims 4-5 are is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shigihara et al (US 6,094,815)/Sun (US 5,507,617)/Papst et al (US 3,786,290) as applied to claims 1, 3 above, and further in view of Askey et al (US 4,860,567).

Re claim 4: Shigihara/Sun/Papst fail to disclose subsequently forging forming a cavity within said cylindrical body being a cylindrical billet by means of a punch that is forced into the billet, while preventing at the same time radial expansions of the billet through confinement in a mold.

Askey discloses subsequently forging forming a cavity (Fig. 2) within said cylindrical body being a cylindrical billet (10) by means of a punch (20) that is forced into the billet, while preventing at the same time radial expansions of the billet through confinement in a mold (30).

Art Unit: 3726

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Shigihara/Sun/Papst by subsequently forging forming a cavity within said cylindrical body being a cylindrical billet by means of a punch that is forced into the billet, while preventing at the same time radial expansions of the billet through confinement in a mold to the Shigihara/Sun/Papst, as taught by Askey, for the purpose of forming the blind cavity in the billet without requiring additional processing steps.

Re claim 5: Shigihara discloses in col. 4, lines 6-8 refining by subsequent mechanical working, except for extending said cavity over a part of said cylindrical billet.

Askey discloses extending said cavity over a part of said cylindrical billet (Fig. 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Shigihara/Sun/Papst by extending said cavity over a part of said cylindrical billet to the Shigihara/Sun/Papst, as taught by Askey, for the purpose of forming the blind cavity in the billet without requiring additional processing steps.

6. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shigihara et al (US 6,094,815)/Sun (US 5,507,617)/Papst et al (US 3,786,290)/Askey et al (US 4,860,567) as applied to claims 7 and 3-5 above, and further in view of Parizek (US 4,789,410).

Papst discloses forming a central bore (where 11 is going thru 14) on a bottom of the cavity (where 11 lies), except for subsequently performing a thermal treatment.

Parizek discloses performing a thermal treatment (Abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Shigihara/Sun/Papst/Askey by subsequently performing a thermal treatment

Art Unit: 3726

to the Shigihara/Sun/Papst/Askey, as taught by Parizek, for the purpose of establishing metallurgical and mechanical properties.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 6/27/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The examiner thanks the applicants for providing reference numerals to the claimed limitations.

From S1 to S4, as can be seen from Fig. 5, 101 to 70 have the same diameter. The limitation "wherein during . . . is prevented" is met. The section of the prior art the applicants are making the argument is nothing more than a possibility. If the bar is smaller, 10 and 20 will prevent a radial expansion.

Conclusion

8. Please provide reference numerals (either in parentheses next to the claimed limitation or in a table format with one column listing the claimed limitation and another column listing corresponding reference numerals in the remark section of the response to the Office Action) to all the claimed limitations as well as support in the disclosure for better clarity (optional).

Applicants are duly reminded that a full and proper response to this Office Action that includes any amendment to the claims and specification of the application as originally filed requires that the applicant point out the support for any amendment made to the disclosure, including the claims. See 37 CFR 1.111 and MPEP 2163.06.

Art Unit: 3726

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rick K. Chang whose telephone number is (571) 272-4564. The examiner can normally be reached on 5:30 AM to 1:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David P. Bryant can be reached on (571) 272-4526. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Rick K. Chang/
Primary Examiner, A.U. 3726

RC
October 20, 2008